

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The foregoing amendment and the following arguments are provided to impart precision to the claims, by more particularly pointing out the invention, rather than to avoid prior art.

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,835,360 (hereinafter "Jansen").

Claim 1 includes the limitations of a second output which is different from a first output, and a second stage that transforms the second output to generate a third output coupled to drive the second component. Jansen does not disclose these limitations, and as a result does not anticipate claim 1.

Specifically, Jansen discloses that the output voltage of the second circuit 32 is dependent on the output voltage chosen for the first output circuit 31 (Col. 4, lines 1-3). The output of the second output circuit 32 is different from the output of the first output circuit 31 (Col. 4, lines 10-12). It appears that the Examiner believes that the first output circuit 31 of Jansen corresponds to the first stage of claim 1 and that the second output circuit 32 of Jansen corresponds to the second stage of claim 1. However, Jansen fails to disclose a second output (from the first stage) as claimed in claim 1. Specifically, there is nothing in Jansen which discloses a second output from a first stage where the second output is different from the first output of the first stage.

Claim 1 also includes a limitation of where a first stage drives the second stage using the second output. The second output circuit 32 is driven by the +ve voltage through the switching device 34, which also drives the first output circuit 31. The second output circuit 32 is merely dependent on the output of the first

output circuit 31 (Col. 4, lines 1-4), and is not *driven* by it, since both output circuits 31 and 32 are driven by the same source.

Claims 2, 3, and 7 depend from claim 1, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 1. Since claim 1 is not anticipated by Jensen, claims 2, 3, and 7 are also not anticipated by Jensen.

Claim 9 includes the limitations of a second output which is different from a first output, and a second circuit that transforms the second output to generate a third output coupled to drive the second component. Jensen does not disclose these limitations, and as a result does not anticipate claim 9.

Specifically, as mentioned above, the second output circuit 32 cannot drive itself. Further, both output circuits 31 and 32 of Jensen are driven by the same source. Therefore, since Jensen does not disclose all the limitations of claim 9, claim 9 is not anticipated by Jensen.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 15, and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jensen in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

Independent claim 15 includes the limitation of a main circuit that drives a secondary circuit using a second output which is different from a first output, and wherein the secondary circuit transforms the second output to generate a third output to drive the microprocessor. Neither Jensen nor AAPA disclose this limitation, and as a result claim 15 is patentable over Jensen and AAPA.

Specifically, as mentioned above, the outputs of Jensen are driven by the same source. There is also no second output different from a first output as in claim 1, since the output of the first output circuit 31 of Jensen is not equivalent to the second output of Claim 15. As a result, claim 15 is patentable over Jensen and AAPA.

Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, and 17-20 depend from the independent claims discussed above, and therefore include all the limitations of those claims. AAPA does not add the missing limitations discussed above. As a result, claims 5, 6, 12, 13, and 17-20 are patentable over Jensen and AAPA.

Examiner rejected claims 4, 8, 11, 14, and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jansen.

Claims 4, 8, 11, 14, and 21-22 depend from the independent claims discussed above, and therefore include all the limitations of those claims. Since the independent claims are not anticipated by Jensen, claims 4, 8, 11, 14, and 21-22 are patentable over Jensen.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call Arlen Hartounian at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: _____

8/16/04



Arlen Hartounian
Reg. No. 52,997

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300